

REMARKS

In response to the above-identified Final Office Action, Applicants seek reconsideration in view of the following remarks. In this response, Applicants do not add or cancel any claims. Applicants amend claims 35, 36, 39-41, 43, 45-49, and 53-56. Applicants add claims 57 and 58. Accordingly, claims 35-49 and 53-58 are pending.

I. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 35-38 and 40-53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,333,973 issued to Smith, et al. (hereinafter "Smith"). Applicants respectfully disagree for the following reasons.

It is axiomatic that to anticipate a claim the Examiner must establish that each element of the claim is taught by a single reference. In regard to claims 35 and 44, these claims have been amended to include the elements of "in response to a user input from a SEND button, automatically selecting a form." The Examiner has not indicated and Applicants have been unable to discern any part of Smith that teaches the use of a SEND button that automatically results in the selection of a form. Rather, as the Examiner states on page 2 of the Office Action "in the event the user of the MT receives one of the above type messages (for example an ink/SMS message) and desires to respond to the message, the user selects the TOOL button and selects the write option." See col. 11, lines 1-10; figure 13B. Thus, Smith teaches a system which requires selection of a TOOL button and selection of a write option in order for a message composition screen to be initiated. Thus, Smith does not teach each of the elements of claim 35 and 44. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of claims 35 and 44 are requested.

In regard to claims 36-43, 45 and 46, these claims depend from independent claims 35 and 44 and incorporate the limitations thereof. Thus, at least for the reasons mentioned above in regard to independent claims 35 and 44, these claims are not anticipated by Smith. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of claims 36-43, 45 and 46 are requested.

In regard to claim 47, this claim includes the elements of responding to user input by "displaying a *user designated* reply form based on a content of the displayed information at the time the user input is received." Smith does not teach these elements of claim 47. The Examiner has not indicated and Applicants have been unable to discern any part of Smith that teaches that a user may designate a reply form to be displayed when a transmission mode has been entered. Thus, Smith does not teach each of the elements of claim 47. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of claim 47 are requested.

Claims 48 and 49 depend from independent claim 47 and incorporate the limitations thereof. Thus, for the reasons mentioned above in regard to independent claim 47, these claims are not anticipated by Smith. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of these claims are requested.

In regard to claim 53, this claim, as amended, includes the element of monitoring the content of received data for "user defined content" and "responsive to detecting the user defined content ... automatically entering a transmission node." The Examiner has not indicated and Applicants have been unable to discern any part of Smith that teaches allowing a user to define content to be monitored for incoming data and in response to detecting this user defined data automatically entering a transmission node. Thus, Smith does not teach each of the elements of claim 53. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of claim 53 are requested.

II. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 39 and 54-56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Smith, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,301,338 issued to Mäkelä (hereinafter "Mäkelä"). In regard to claim 39, this claim depends from independent claim 35 and incorporates the limitations thereof. Thus, at least for the reasons mentioned above in regard to independent claim 35, Smith does not teach automatically selecting a form in response to user input of a SEND button. The Examiner has not indicated and Applicants have been unable to discern any part of Mäkelä that cures this

defect of Smith. According, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of claim 39 are requested.

In regard to claims 54 and 55, these claims depend from independent claims 53 and incorporate the limitations thereof. Thus, for the reasons mentioned above in regard to claim 53, Smith does not teach or suggest monitoring for user defined content or automatically entering a transmission mode upon detecting the user defined content. The Examiner has not indicated and Applicants have been unable to discern any part of Mäkelä that teaches or suggest these elements of claim 53. Therefore, Smith in view of Mäkelä does not teach or suggest each of the elements of claims 54 and 55. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of these claims are requested.

In regard to claim 56, this claim, as amended, includes the element of a "control circuit ... to detect user defined content." The Examiner has not indicated and Applicants have been unable to discern any part of Smith or Mäkelä that teaches or suggests these elements of claim 56. Specifically, the Applicants have been unable to discern any part of Smith or Mäkelä that teaches detecting user defined data as recited in claim 56. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of claim 56 are requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending, namely claims 35-49 and 53-58 patentably define the subject invention over the prior art of record, and are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would be useful in moving the application forward to allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (310) 207 3800.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP




Dated: 10/11, 2004

Jonathan S. Miller, Reg. No. 48,534

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION:

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on October 11, 2004.


Lillian E. Rodriguez

10-11-04
October 11, 2004

12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
(310) 207-3800

82225P2813D3

10

09/405,826